

**COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH  
OVERSIGHT DIVISION  
FISCAL NOTE**

**L.R. NO.:** 2626-16  
**BILL NO.:** SCS For HS For HCS for HB 1076 With SAs 1, 2, 6, 10, 12, 13, and 14  
**SUBJECT:** Education, Elementary and Secondary: Math Grant Program  
**TYPE:** Original  
**DATE:** May 10, 2000

<b><u>FISCAL SUMMARY</u></b>			
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON STATE FUNDS</b>			
<b>FUND AFFECTED</b>	<b>FY 2001</b>	<b>FY 2002</b>	<b>FY 2003</b>
General Revenue*	(\$87,648)	(\$69,976)	(\$71,749)
State School Moneys	(\$2,107,900 to \$2,307,900)	(\$2,107,900 to \$2,307,900)	(\$2,107,900 to \$2,307,900)
Gaming Proceeds for Education Fund or Gaming Commission Fund or Lottery Proceeds for Education Fund	\$0	(\$0 to \$4,700,000)	(\$0 to \$1,000,000)
Excellence in Education	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> State Funds*</b>	<b>(\$2,195,548 to \$2,395,548)</b>	<b>(\$2,177,876 to \$7,077,876)</b>	<b>(\$2,179,649 to \$3,379,649)</b>
<b>*Excludes unknown costs for grants, expected to exceed \$100,000 annually.</b>			
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS</b>			
<b>FUND AFFECTED</b>	<b>FY 2001</b>	<b>FY 2002</b>	<b>FY 2003</b>
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS</b>			

L.R. NO. 2626-16

BILL NO. SCS For HS For HCS for HB 1076 With SAs 1, 2, 6, 10, 12, 13, and 14

PAGE 2 OF 16

May 10, 2000

FUND AFFECTED	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003
Local Government*	Greater Than \$2,100,000 to \$2,300,000	Greater Than \$1,436,610 to \$2,100,000	(\$2,263,390) to Greater Than \$2,100,000

\*Excludes net effect of unknown grant income and grant program costs.

A redistribution of funding to schools districts could result from estimating eligible pupils.

Numbers within parentheses: ( ) indicate costs or losses.

This fiscal note contains 16 pages.

### FISCAL ANALYSIS

#### ASSUMPTION

##### Mastering Math Program

Officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE)** assume DESE would require a supervisor and senior secretary to adequately staff the program. Additionally, there would be some information technology (IT) costs associated with developing a web-based application process.

The grant amounts to be distributed by the program are not specified. For the program to be significant the amount to be appropriated for this purpose is assumed to be in excess of \$100,000; however an unknown cost is assumed by DESE.

DESE officials assume one FTE Supervisor (\$47,611) and one FTE Senior Secretary (\$24,176) would be needed to develop the application, evaluate applications, administer grants and answer questions.

The **Oversight Division** assumes the Supervisor could administer the grant program with existing secretarial staff. Therefore, Oversight has excluded the Senior Secretary from the fiscal impact section. Oversight has also excluded travel costs of \$4,500 annually, assuming the grant would be administered with minimal travel.

#### ASSUMPTION (continued)

DESE's IT section would be required to develop and maintain software. This is estimated to cost \$83,200 the first year. Additionally, OIT charges an 8% project management fee (\$6,656).

JM:LR:OD:005 (9-94)

Maintenance costs for subsequent years are estimated to be 15% of this amount in subsequent years. The **Oversight Division** assumes the grant software could be modeled after existing DESE grant programs and could be developed and maintained with existing DESE resources.

DESE officials assume increased state money would go to school districts successfully applying for grants. The amount of local assistance would depend on the amount appropriated by the General Assembly for grants and awarded to applicants.

#### Estimating Eligible Pupils

Officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE)** assume the proposal would result in additional cost to the state aid formula. However, allowing such a district an extended period of time to repay the overpayment delays the redistribution of that money to the remaining districts in the state. Those districts would have received that money initially if the other district's data had been accurate.

#### Teacher Minimum Salaries

##### Base Estimate of Salary Supplement

The following table shows the impact if implemented in FY 2000.

##### Baccalaureate:

0-5 yrs	\$22,000	\$2,401,332	(1,885 FTE)
6-19 yrs	\$25,000	\$2,301,107	(1,326 FTE)
greater than 19 yrs	\$28,000	\$1,305,127	( 606 FTE)

##### Masters or equivalent:

greater than 10 yrs	\$28,000	\$ 510,947	( 356 FTE)
greater than 19 yrs	\$34,000	\$3,381,229	(1,083 FTE)
greater than 29 yrs	\$40,000	\$1,884,196	( 359 FTE)

FY 2000 data was used to estimate the impact of these provisions if it were to take effect in FY 2000. This supplement amount would be approximately \$11.8 million. However, the bill is not effective for FY 2000, therefore there is no impact.

#### ASSUMPTION (continued)

##### FY 2001

FY 2001 salaries will increase statewide approximately 2.5%, thereby reducing the supplement base estimate to \$8.3 million:

L.R. NO. 2626-16

BILL NO. SCS For HS For HCS for HB 1076 With SAs 1, 2, 6, 10, 12, 13, and 14

PAGE 4 OF 16

May 10, 2000

- (1) FY 2001 -- \$141.0 million in local effort X 2.5% = \$3.5 million;  
\$11.8 million - \$3.5 = \$8.3 million (base estimate of salary amount);
- (2) No projected impact. Bill not effective yet.

#### FY 2002

FY 2002 salaries will increase statewide approximately 2.5%, thereby reducing the supplement base estimate to \$4.7 million:

- (1) FY 2002 -- \$144.5 million in local effort X 2.5% = \$3.6 million;  
\$8.3 million - \$3.6 = \$4.7 million;
- (2) This is the first year in which the salary schedule will be in effect. Therefore, this \$4.7 million is the projected state cost for FY 2002.

#### FY 2003

FY 2003 salaries will increase statewide approximately 2.5%, thereby reducing the supplement base estimate to approximately \$1.0 million:

- (1) FY 2003 -- \$148.1 million in local effort X 2.5% = \$3.7 million;  
\$4.7 million - \$3.7 = \$1.0 million;
- (2) This \$1.0 million is the projected state cost for FY 2003.

#### Career Ladder

The increase in minimum salary requirements does not increase the Career Ladder cost. However, the Career Ladder supplement a teacher may receive cannot be used to meet the minimum salary requirement for that teacher.

#### General Revenue Fund

A program will need to be written to identify the teachers in each category, the amount of salary supplement required, and the eligibility criteria for receiving the money. Therefore, DESE will incur an IT impact estimated to be \$25,000 in FY 2001, and 15% estimated maintenance costs for FYs 2002 and 2003. Additionally, an 8% project management fee is needed for FY 2001.

#### Excellence in Education Fund

If the salary supplement is not fully funded then provision for prorating teacher salary supplements is made. However, for purposes of this fiscal note, 100% funding of the supplement is assumed.

#### ASSUMPTION (continued)

#### Salary Level Increase Provision

Minimum salary levels are increased by \$1,000 in the second fiscal year following the fiscal year in which the state cost of state funding of minimum salaries is 85% or less than the amount of state funding required for the first year. These impacts are not expected to occur until after FY 2003.

Estimate of District Expense for Retirement Match

Districts will be responsible for a 10.5% retirement match. Estimates for these amounts are calculated from the FY 2002 estimate for salary supplements generated in the state impact portion of the fiscal note.

FY 2002 \$4.7 million X 10.5% = \$493,500

FY 2003 \$1.0 million X 10.5% = \$105,000

This amount is also used for FY 2003; however, as schools increase their salary schedules, the retirement impacts directly attributable to this bill will decline.

The **Oversight Division** has calculated school districts' fringe benefits at 18.37% to include retirement, FICA, unemployment and worker's compensation on the salary increases. Therefore, the local school districts' fiscal impact for fringe benefits would be \$4.7 million X 18.37% = \$863,390.

The **Oversight Division** has included the salary increase of \$4.7 million as an annual cost to school districts for FY 2002 and 2003.

The proposal states that the salary supplements would be funded from "increases in state revenues from taxation of riverboat gaming operations, including boarding fees and lottery proceeds, compared to the amount of these revenues appointed in fiscal year 2001." Section 313.822, RSMo., directs the adjusted gross receipts tax from gambling games to the Gaming Proceeds for Education Fund. Section 313.835, RSMo., directs gambling boat admission fees to the Gaming Commission Fund. Article III, Section 39(b), of the Constitution of Missouri directs lottery net proceeds after payment of prizes and administrative expenses to the Lottery Proceeds Fund for elementary, secondary and higher education. Gaming Commission Fund net proceeds are earmarked under current law. However, for purposes of this fiscal note, the **Oversight Division** assumes the salary supplement funding would be transferred from either the Gaming Proceeds for Education Fund, the Gaming Commission Fund or the Lottery Proceeds for Education Fund to the Excellence in Education Fund, which is the fund required to pay salary supplements per Section 163.172.5 of the proposal. Oversight has ranged DESE's estimated

ASSUMPTION (continued)

costs from zero, since the funding would depend on increases from FY 2001.

Reading Assessments

Officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE)** assume there may be some additional state aid going to districts due to a potential increase in summer school enrollments. On a statewide basis, the amount is estimated to be \$107,900. This would

affect the state schools moneys fund.

- (a) 400 students (new to summer school) X 40 hours = 16,000 hours attendance;
- (b)  $16,000/1,044 = 15$  ADA (rounded);
- (c) 15 ADA X 2 = 30 eligible pupils;
- (d) 30 eligible pupils X \$2.75 X \$130,789/100 = \$107,900

#### Retired Teachers

Officials from the **Joint Committee on Public Employee Retirement** stated their review of the legislation indicates it is not a “substantial proposed change” in future plan benefits as defined in Section 105.660(5). Therefore, no actuarial cost statement is required for this legislation.

Officials from the **Public School Retirement System** assume the proposal does not appear to create a “substantial proposed change” as that term is defined in Section 105.660, RSMo.

Officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE)** assume the provision would have minimal impact on local public school districts. Therefore, **Oversight** assumes the school districts could absorb the costs, if any.

#### Junior College District Property Taxes

Officials from the **State Tax Commission** assume the proposal would result in no fiscal impact to the agency.

Officials from the **Coordinating Board For Higher Education (CBHE)** assume there is no fiscal impact to the state as this proposal only impacts local tax levies. There is no connection between a community college’s local tax revenue and the appropriations made by the state. This legislation allows community colleges that are surpassing a certain valuation cutoff to maintain their current levy rather than having to roll back to the lower levy once a certain valuation limit is reached.

#### ASSUMPTION (continued)

The **Oversight Division** assumes the proposal would allow affected junior college districts to maintain their property tax levy with growth in the assessed valuation. This could keep the districts from being required to rollback their levies. Oversight has included income greater than \$100,000 in the local government fiscal impact for junior college districts.

#### Assessment Tests

Officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE)** assume the

proposal would result in no significant fiscal impact to DESE or local public school districts.

*Penalties by Concentrated Animal Feeding Operation*

Officials from the **Attorney General's Office** assume the proposal would result in no fiscal impact to the agency.

Officials from the **Department of Natural Resources** state that pursuant to Article IX, Section 7, of the Missouri Constitution, all penalties received as a result of the department's regulatory action are required to be deposited in the appropriate county school fund. The bill would not impact the department's authority; therefore, DNR would not be impacted by the legislation.

Officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE)** assume the proposal would be cost neutral to the state. DESE officials assume money received from penalties paid by a concentrated animal feeding operation is not a deduction in the basic state aid formula. Since it is not a deduction, placing the revenue in the Capital Projects Fund would have no impact on the basic state aid formula. The proposal would give the district the authority to place the revenue in the Incidental or Capital Projects Funds. Currently, the revenue must be placed in the Teachers Fund.

*Teacher Cadet Program*

Officials from the **Southwest Missouri State University, Central Missouri State University** and **Harris-Stowe State College** assume the proposal would result in no fiscal impact to the institutions.

Officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE)** assume the proposal would result in no fiscal impact to DESE or local public school districts.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Officials from the **University of Missouri** assume the university would incur approximately \$5.00 per student in administrative processing costs. The **Oversight Division** assumes the university could absorb this additional cost with current resources.

Officials from the **Secretary of State's Office (SOS)** assume the rules, regulations and forms issued by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education could require as many as approximately 4 pages in the Code of State Regulations. For any given rule, roughly half again as many pages are published in the Missouri Register as in the Code because cost statements, fiscal notes and the like are not repeated in the Code. These costs are estimated. The estimated

cost of a page in the Missouri Register is \$22.50. The estimated cost of a page in the Code of State Regulations is \$26.50. The actual costs could be more or less the SOS's estimated cost of \$241 for FY 2001. The impact of this legislation in future years is unknown and depends upon the frequency and length of rules, filed, amended, rescinded or withdrawn. **Oversight** assumes the SOS could absorb the costs of printing and distributing regulations related to this proposal. If multiple bills pass which require the printing and distribution of regulations at substantial costs, the SOS could request funding through the appropriation process. Any decisions to raise fees to defray costs would likely be made in subsequent fiscal years.

Officials from the **Coordinating Board For Higher Education (CBHE)** assume there could be a fiscal impact on the CBHE depending upon the level of statewide variation in the Teacher Cadet Programs at participating school districts. Under this legislation, CBHE would be required to determine an amount of credit to be awarded to high school students for the completion of a Teacher Cadet Program. The minimal criteria for these programs would be developed by DESE, yet other elements could be added by the particular school district. Thus, there could be as many as 525 different Teacher Cadet Programs that the CBHE would have to review and evaluate before assigning a college credit amount. If the programs are uniform across the state, the CBHE could assign a credit amount with minimal expense. However, if a large number of widely varying programs are developed, it could result in a significant impact as the CBHE currently has no staff for such an activity. CBHE has no such staff because decisions on the granting of college credit are made exclusively by the higher education institution granting the credit. CBHE officials assume there could also be an impact on public institutions of higher education. **Oversight** assumes that since DESE would be involved in developing the minimum criteria for the program, the programs would be relatively uniform. Therefore, Oversight assumes the CBHE could accomplish the provisions of the proposal with existing resources.

#### ASSUMPTION (continued)

##### State Aid to Public Schools

##### State Aid to Hold Harmless School Districts

Officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE)** assume that while the cost of this proposal is unknown, it is likely to be minimal. A specific impact can not be developed because DESE does not have the number of voluntary transfer students eligible for free or reduced price lunch for 1997-98 and will collect that data if this legislation is passed. Nevertheless, the cost is likely to be minimal because the 2000-2001 hold harmless cost may decrease without this change because these St. Louis County districts will likely see a decrease in the Line 14 amount compared to the 1997-98 Line 14. This decrease would result in a reduced



hold harmless payment amount. Therefore, adjusting the calculation to exclude voluntary transfer students may result in the FY01 cost being similar to the FY00 cost. DESE officials assume the cost would be less than \$100,000 annually.

#### Recalculated Levy

Officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE)** assume that regarding the change in Line 14, for FY 01, approximately 125 districts would benefit from this change at an approximate state cost of \$2 million. A similar fiscal impact is assumed for FY 2002 and 2003. It is assumed that the additional state cost will be to the State Schools Moneys Fund.

#### Alternative Education

Officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE)** assume that this bill potentially increases the cost to fund the state aid formula at 1.00 because the district with the alternative school may receive more state aid per eligible pupil than the district of residence. There is a potential increased cost to the state aid formula, but the cost is unknown; however, DESE officials assume the cost would be less than \$100,000 annually.

#### ACT Scores

Officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE)** assume the provision would result in no fiscal impact to the agency.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u>	FY 2001 (10 Mo.)	FY 2002	FY 2003
<b>GENERAL REVENUE FUND</b>			
<u>Cost-Department of Elementary and Secondary Education</u>			
Personal Services (1 FTE)	(\$40,651)	(\$50,021)	(\$51,272)
Fringe Benefits	(\$12,500)	(\$15,381)	(\$15,766)
Expense and Equipment	(\$7,497)	(\$824)	(\$848)
Grants	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
Programming	(\$27,000)	(\$3,750)	(\$3,863)
Total <u>Cost-DESE*</u>	<u>(\$87,648)</u>	<u>(\$69,976)</u>	<u>(\$71,749)</u>

**\*Excludes unknown costs for grants, expected to exceed \$100,000 annually.**

L.R. NO. 2626-16

BILL NO. SCS For HS For HCS for HB 1076 With SAs 1, 2, 6, 10, 12, 13, and 14

PAGE 10 OF 16

May 10, 2000

FISCAL IMPACT - State Government

FY 2001  
(10 Mo.)

FY 2002

FY 2003

**STATE SCHOOL MONEYS FUND**

Cost-Department of Elementary and  
Secondary Education (DESE)

State Aid-Summer School	(\$107,900)	(\$107,900)	(\$107,900)
State Aid-Hold Harmless Districts	Less Than (\$100,000)	Less Than (\$100,000)	Less Than (\$100,000)
State Aid-Line 14	(\$2,000,000)	(\$2,000,000)	(\$2,000,000)
Alternative School Services	Less Than (\$100,000)	Less Than (\$100,000)	Less Than (\$100,000)
	<u>(\$2,107,900 to \$2,307,900)</u>	<u>(\$2,107,900 to \$2,307,900)</u>	<u>(\$2,107,900 to \$2,307,900)</u>

**GAMING PROCEEDS FOR  
EDUCATION FUND OR GAMING  
COMMISSION FUND OR LOTTERY  
PROCEEDS FOR EDUCATION  
FUND**

Cost-Gaming Proceeds for Education  
Fund or Gaming Commission Fund or  
Lottery Proceeds for Education Fund  
Transfer to Excellence in Education Fund  
Transfer to Excellence in Education  
Fund

\$0

(\$0 to  
\$4,700,000)

(\$0 to  
\$1,000,000)

**EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION  
FUND**

Income-Department of Elementary and  
Secondary Education (DESE)

JM:LR:OD:005 (9-94)

L.R. NO. 2626-16

BILL NO. SCS For HS For HCS for HB 1076 With SAs 1, 2, 6, 10, 12, 13, and 14

PAGE 11 OF 16

May 10, 2000

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u>	FY 2001 (10 Mo.)	FY 2002	FY 2003
Transfer from Gaming Proceeds for Education Fund or Gaming Commission Fund or Lottery Proceeds for Education Fund	\$0	\$0 to \$4,700,000	\$0 to \$1,000,000
<u>Cost-Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE)</u>			
Salary Supplements to School Districts	\$0	(\$0 to \$4,700,000)	(\$0 to \$1,000,000)
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION FUND</b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u>	FY 2001 (10 Mo.)	FY 2002	FY 2003
<b>SCHOOL DISTRICTS</b>			
<u>Income-School Districts</u>			
Grants from DESE	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Salary Supplements	\$0	\$0 to \$4,700,000	\$0 to \$1,000,000
State Aid-Summer School	\$107,900	\$107,900	\$107,900
State Aid-Hold Harmless Districts	Less Than \$100,000	Less Than \$100,000	Less Than \$100,000
State Aid-Line 14	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000
Alternative School Services	Less Than \$100,000	Less Than \$100,000	Less Than \$100,000
Junior College District Taxes	Greater Than <u>\$100,000</u>	Greater Than <u>\$100,000</u>	Greater Than <u>\$100,000</u>

JM:LR:OD:005 (9-94)

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u>	FY 2001 (10 Mo.)	FY 2002	FY 2003
Total <u>Income</u> -School Districts	Greater Than \$2,207,900 to \$2,407,900	Greater Than \$2,207,900 to \$7,107,900	Greater Than \$2,207,900 to \$3,407,900
<u>Cost School Districts</u>			
Grant Match	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
Mastering Math Program	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
Salaries	\$0	(\$0 to \$4,700,000)	(\$0 to \$4,700,000)
Fringe Benefits	<u>\$0</u>	(\$0 to \$863,390)	(\$0 to \$863,390)
Summer School	<u>(\$107,900)</u>	<u>(\$107,900)</u>	<u>(\$107,900)</u>
Total <u>Cost</u> -School Districts	(\$107,900)	(\$107,900 to \$5,671,290)	(\$107,900 to \$5,671,290)
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON SCHOOL DISTRICTS*</b>	<b>Greater Than \$2,100,000 to <u>\$2,300,000</u></b>	<b>Greater Than \$1,436,610 to <u>\$2,100,000</u></b>	<b>(\$2,263,390) to Greater Than <u>\$2,100,000</u></b>

**\*Excludes net effect of unknown grant income and grant program costs.  
 A redistribution of funding to schools districts could result from estimating eligible pupils.**

## DESCRIPTION

### Mastering Math Program

The proposal would create the Mastering Math Program. Beginning July 1, 2001, DESE would provide four-year competitive matching grants to assist public school districts in math programs.

Upon conclusion of the grant and based on improvement in student performance on the math portion of the statewide assessment, DESE could reimburse the grantee for its local match.

### Estimating Eligible Pupils

The proposal applies to any error made in the apportionment of state aid due to a difference between the actual number of eligible pupils and the estimated number of pupils to any school district which has, for at least five years immediately preceding the year in which an error in estimating the number of eligible pupils is discovered, adopted a school calendar for twelve months. If the amount paid exceeds the amount to which the district was actually entitled by more than five percent, then the excess plus accrued interest would be deducted over a period

specified by the district, but not longer than 60 months. Current law requires the deduction to be made the next succeeding year.

The proposal contains an emergency clause.

### Teacher Minimum Salaries

The Commissioner of Education would present to the General Assembly a history of the cost to the state for teachers' minimum salary.

Beginning with the 2001-2002 school year, the minimum salary for a full-time teacher would be \$22,000, for a full-time teacher with at least five years experience would be \$25,000, for a full-time teacher with nineteen years experience or a full-time teacher with a master's degree and ten years experience would be \$28,000, for a full-time teacher with a master's degree and at least nineteen years experience would be \$34,000, and the minimum salary for a full-time teacher with a master's degree and at least twenty-nine years experience would be \$40,000.

## DESCRIPTION (Continued)

### Reading Assessments

Unless a student has been determined to be reading at grade level or above, each school district would administer a reading assessment to each student within forty-five days of the end of the third-grade year, except that the assessment and retention provisions would not apply to certain students. For each student whose third-grade reading assessment determines the student is reading below second grade level, the school district would design a reading improvement plan for the student's fourth grade year.

For the 2000-2001 school year only, school districts would administer a reading assessment to each fourth and fifth grade student unless the student is reading at or above grade level. The students could be required to attend summer school.

This provision contains an emergency clause.

### Retired Teachers

The proposal would allow retired teachers to teach in any school district, except the total number could not exceed the greater of ten percent of the total certificated staff or five persons. The affected retirement system would complete an actuarial study assuring the provisions are cost-neutral, and the system would remain actuarially sound. All necessary costs would be paid by the hiring school district. Retirees could be employed full-time in a non-administrative position for up to two years without losing benefits.

Junior College District Property Taxes

The proposal would change the assessed valuation limitations on property taxes imposed without voter approval for junior college districts.

Assessment Tests

The score on any assessment test of any student for whom English is a second language would not be counted until the student has been educated for three full school years in a school in which English is the primary language.

DESCRIPTION (Continued)

Penalties by Concentrated Animal Feeding Operation

Money received from the county school fund from penalties paid by a concentrated animal feeding operation as defined by the Department of Natural Resources would be placed to the credit of the fund or funds designated by the board.

Teacher Cadet Program

Any school district could develop a "Teacher Cadet Program". The program would consist of courses and activities. The course could be offered at all, or any one of, the secondary schools in the district. The course would provide introductory instruction in the field of elementary and secondary classroom teaching.

The proposal would provide student eligibility requirements for the program.

Any student successfully completing the program would be eligible for college credit in an amount to be determined by the CBHE and given preference in approval for any teaching scholarship.

L.R. NO. 2626-16  
BILL NO. SCS For HS For HCS for HB 1076 With SAs 1, 2, 6, 10, 12, 13, and 14  
PAGE 15 OF 16  
May 10, 2000

DESE would develop minimum criteria for the program.

State Aid to Public Schools

State Aid to Hold Harmless School Districts

The proposal would revise state school aid to “hold harmless” districts.

Recalculated Levy

An increase in the payment amount of line 14 (a) of the school foundation formula would be made by DESE if needed to ensure that a school district would receive no less total revenue from lines 14 (a) and 14 (b) than the district would receive if it levied an operating levy no greater than \$2.75 per one hundred dollars assessed valuation.

Alternative Education

For the purposes of determining state aid, a nonresident student enrolled pursuant to a contract authorized to provide alternative education could be counted, at the election of the serving school district, as a resident pupil.

DESCRIPTION (Continued)

ACT Scores

When DESE release ACT scores, they would be required to report scores for public and non-public school separately.

This legislation is not federally mandated, would not duplicate any other program and would not require additional capital improvements or rental space.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Department of Elementary and Secondary Education  
Coordinating Board For Higher Education  
Joint Committee on Public Employee Retirement  
State Tax Commission  
Department of Natural Resources  
Public School Retirement System  
Attorney General’s Office  
Secretary of State’s Office  
Southwest Missouri State University  
Central Missouri State University

JM:LR:OD:005 (9-94)

L.R. NO. 2626-16

BILL NO. SCS For HS For HCS for HB 1076 With SAs 1, 2, 6, 10, 12, 13, and 14

PAGE 16 OF 16

May 10, 2000

Harris-Stowe State College  
University of Missouri

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jeanne Jarrett". The signature is stylized with a large initial "J" and a cursive "e" at the end.

Jeanne Jarrett, CPA

Director

May 10, 2000